

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

One great hindrance to the study of Arabic is the cost of books, and, it might even be added, the lack of the right kind of books at any cost. There is not one grammar that gives, in a succinct and clear form, such an insight into Arabic as is furnished by fifty Latin, or Greek grammars to those wishing to pursue either of these languages. W. SPROULL.

גַּן־בְּעֵדֶן.—"Eden" (Heb. עֵדֶן) had originally nothing to do with עֵדֶן, pl. עֲדָנִים. The Hebrews received the word (meaning "field," "plain") from the Babylonians. The usual Assyrian ideograph for "field," "Steppe," "plain," is explained in the syllabaries (vid. *Haupt*, ASK, 18, No. 312) by í-di-nu, *i. e.*, עֵדֶן, and as this word appears, at the same time, in the left column of the syllabary (as í-di-in), it may be supposed that it was an old (*uraltes*), non-Semitic word, which later passed over into the Semitic (Del.). Eden, as used by the Hebrew writer, is, of course, a *proper name*, which the Hebrews, as often happens in such cases, interpreted after their own etymology, and which they probably connected with עֵדֶן in the meaning "joy," "pleasure."—In this "field" Jahveh planted a "garden," in which he placed the man. The ideograph in Assyrian for the conception "garden," read kar and gan, is explained, as regards its meaning in the syllabaries (vid. III., R, 70, 96; ASK, 15, 217) by Assyr. ginû (gi-nu-u), Accad. ga-na, and, aside from this, it is, for the Assyrian, made clear through ik-lu, *i. e.*, חָקַל, "field." It must remain undecided whether this word which is found in *all* the Semitic languages, also in the Ethiopic, is to be regarded as non-Semitic, but Sumero-Accadian (*Sayce*, *Haupt*, *Del.*), *i. e.*, as a foreign word in these languages, as "Park" in ours. The possibility that this word passed from the Semitic into the Accadian is, in our opinion, equally as probable, because (vid. F. Del. PD. 135) the proper and, at all events, older word for "garden," in the Accadian, seems to have been kar; gun, gin replaced kar, as far as we now see, for the first in the time of Asurbanipal (Assurb. *Smith*, 183). The etymology of the word is also, to say the least, made no less satisfactory by the acceptance of its Semitic origin than by the acceptance of its coming out of the Accadian.—*Schrader's KAT.*[2] R. F.

חִדֶּקֶל (Gen. II., 14), the Hebrew name of the Tigris, occurring also in Dan. X., 4. Noteworthy, as is known, is the pronunciation with prefixed ḥi, which we meet neither in the Aramaic, nor in the Arabic, nor, finally, in the Persian form of the name. It is, however, not specifically Hebraic. It is found also in the Assyrian, but not, however, in the usual texts; these also present only the form "Diglat," *e. g.*, the Behistun (*l. c.*) inscription, Babyl. text l. 35 (Di-ig-lat). We meet it, however, in the more complete syllabaries. One of these (II. Rawl. 50, 7) explains the ideograph in Beh. 34, and known to represent the Tigris (BAR.TIK.KAR) by I-di-ig-lat, *i. e.*, as the syllables a,i,u, in the Assyrian represent also ha, hi, hu,=Hidiglat, a form which, as proposed, corresponds very nearly to the Hebrew pronunciation, and joins itself with the Samaritan הרקל. The hardening of h(i) to ḥ(i), in transfer from one language to another, is, in general, not infrequent. As the Persian Ahuramazdâ, in the inscription of Naksch-i-Rustam, certainly became the Babylonian Aḥurmazda' (together with Urimizda or Uramazda, also Urimizda' of the Behistun inscription), and as the same probably holds good in the Assyrian

itself in the case of the foreign names Hamattu and Amattu "Hamâth," Ha-mîdi and Amîdi "Amid," so it is also probable that this Assyrian and Aramaic דקל(ח) is only hardened in pronunciation from an original דקל(ה)— and that the pronunciation with ק goes back to a still earlier form with ג. Probably the matter stands thus, that Idiglat, especially Diglat (the latter in the Behistun inscription) was the weaker *Babylonian* pronunciation, as reflected in the Persian Tigrâ, and as retained to the present day in the Arabic دِجْلَة, while, in the Hebrew and (cf. ܕܩܠ?) Aramaic, the specifically *Assyrian* pronunciation received precedence. In other cases it is also known that, in Assyrian, a hard, emphatic ק corresponds to a weak ג in the Babylonian, and that, in still other respects, differences exist between the Assyrian and Babylonian pronunciations, is no less well known. Worthy of notice is the rejection of the fem. ending (a,t) in the Hebrew and Aramaic; while the Assyrian and the other languages mentioned above, including the Neo-Persian, have constantly retained it. Cf. the reverse in the Assyrian-Himjaritic-Aramaic עשתר, عشتر, عثتر, in contrast with the Hebrew-Canaanitic עשתרת.—*Schrader's KAT.*[2]

R. F.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Study of Assyrian.—The impression prevails that, unless one has a life-time to devote to it, little can be accomplished in the study of Assyrian. This impression is a mistaken one. It is true, of course, that one's entire life might profitably be devoted to the study; that, to become recognized as an authority in Assyrian, one must give himself up exclusively to this and kindred subjects. But are we to take it for granted that, unless a man is to become a *specialist* in a given department, there is nothing in connection with that department which he may profitably study? Shall no man study Latin except the prospective professor of Latin?

It is probable that the difficulties of Assyrian study have been exaggerated. Or, perhaps the statement may better be made thus: The difficulties which originally existed,—and, it must be conceded, they seemed almost insuperable,—thanks to the arduous labors of such men as Delitzsch, Schrader, Oppert, Sayce, are now largely removed. Difficulties, to be sure, still remain; but, compared with those which have been overcome, they are of a minor character. The greatest difficulty for the student is the mastery of the syllabary, now that it has been quite definitely determined. But we think that an important and helpful step in advance was made during the past summer, when it was decided by an eminent Assyriologist—a practical instructor—that it was expedient, first to get some knowledge of the language through transliterated texts, and then, gradually to master the signs. This method has two advantages: it will encourage the student; and it will enable him to acquire the syllabary all the more rapidly and thoroughly, because he will know the meaning and signification of the roots and formative elements for which the signs stand.

The adoption of this method will induce five men to take up Assyrian where, otherwise, one would have hesitated. Nor need we fear that men will not learn the syllabary, after having gained some knowledge of the language. Surely that